U. man d

Charles Talbert 11484 Xa Bal Phila. Pa. 19144 skelorde gnail.com United States District CourT EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENDSYLVANIA KATE BARKMAN, Clerk Charles Talbert Civil Action NO. 18-1620-MAK Blanche Carney etal . Amended Complaint 1. Plaintiff At the time of occurrence, was a pretial detainer At the Philadelphia Department of Paisons (8119) 2. Blanche Carney (Carney) is the Prison Commissioner of the PDF 3. Gerald Way (May) at the time of occurrence was Warden of the Philadelphia Corran-Frombold Conschool Facility (CFCF). 4. Terrance Clark (Clark), at the time of occurrence, was the Warden of the Philadelphia Detention Center (AC). 2 AU Attainer 9, 5106, 18 radates Devoda no a0.2 sent to CFCF, where May was the Warden And Carney was the Commissioner. 6- Shortly thereafter Plaintiff was transferred from the CFCF Intake Unit to the CFCF general population unit. A day after Plaintiff was taken to the CFCF general population unit he was transported to the DC under Administrative segregation.

8. DeGeodon's Corney May and Clock All had Actual browledge of Plaintiff being moved from the CFCF general population unit to the DC Administrative segregation unit by way of Plaintiffs grievances, and lor by way of said Defendants being notified through chain- of - command in which the Fitnial 20 suorges at boar strabastsal being inved from general population to
Administrative segregation.
9. Said Defendants, have in place, an unconstitu-Etichal Practice of violation Plansit procedural due process rights, by way of placing Plaintiff into administrative pearing, segregation, without any natice, bearing, or chance to be removed from Administrative segregation 10. Defendants placed had placed andlor Knew of Plaintiff being placed into Administrative segregation, without due process, and intentionally and maliciously condoned intentionally and maliciously condoned such confinement by turning a blind-eye and not fixing the issue. 11. Defendants, left Plaintiff in administrative segregation indefinitely without any intention on letting him back into the general population. 12. Defendants Actions, As Aforementioned, demonstrates a plausable claim for retaliation, by way of wanting to punish Plaintiff for exercising his First Amendment right to file other har soits prior to this, Against them, for

Similar conduct 13. By Defendants, being in charge of being the Administration of CPCF, and DC, with final authority to place Plaintiff from general population to administrative segregation, without Plaintiff bowing notice or a bearing, retaliate, and lor violates his procedural due process rights to the Fourteenth Amendment. 14. While Plaintiff was boused indefinitely under administrative segregation, he was subject to the lack of: (A) out door padlor out-of-cell exercise; (8) An sinfested: enting, steeping, showering, (C) lack of Islamic religious material Andlor 15. Additionally, Plaintiff Acquired source chronic lower back pain and spasms to his pre-condition; sore body; suicidal issues; post traumatic stress; and major No supra latoren 16. Plaintiff o' commissary was exten and lor destroyed by mice And Tondres, costing WHEREFORE Plaintiff demands judgment against (4) con bou supord gows des: 200,000,000. (B) punitive damages; \$500,000.00.
(C) Aggravated damages; \$300,000.00.
(D) court costs; and (E) any other relief this Honorable

)	Court deems appropriate.
	Thereby verify under penalty of perjury that the above facts is two
	service that the above facts is two
	and correct.
	harles In(ber)
	to Se Plantit
7 22	
·.)	the contract of the contract o

· ·	

phares tabert Document 23 Howards Mark A- Kearney, USD 1) (A. RA. 19106 601 Market 1

U.S.M.S.